UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/987,760 11/15/2001		Kenneth Ebbs	80168-0127	7168
32658 HOGAN & HA	7590 01/28/2003 RTSON LLP	•	EXAMINER	
ONE TABOR	R CENTER, SUITE 1500 TEEN ST.		TINKLER, MURIEL S	
DENVER, CO			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
٠.			3691	
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/987,760	EBBS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
MURIEL TINKLER	3691	

Defere the Filing of an Annual Drief							
	Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	·	MURIEL TINKLER	3691				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress			
İΗΕ	REPLY FILED 14 January 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.				
Ι. [Σ	□ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
•	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN						
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
	AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
	 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in begappeal; and/or 	ow); tter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for			
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		jected claims.	,			
4. [The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. [Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)):	solv filed amondment	canceling the			
3. L	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) <u>wo</u> uld be allow non-allowable claim(s).		•				
7. [For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:						
	Claim(s) objected to:						
	Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
	IDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence i	s necessary and			
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).			
	☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation DUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.			
	∑ The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	in condition for allowa	nce because:			
	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
		,					
		•					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues that all Stanton fails to disclose each and every aspect of claim 1. Specifically, the Applicant argues that the folloing elements are not disclosed: a software bus providing common access to each of the plurality of services; the software bus and presentation framework operate independently from each other; and, a plurality of extensible modules. The Examiner disagrees. As cited in the final office action mailed on November 16, 2007, the Examiner notes that Stanton discloses a LAN architecture, which is old and well known in the art to encompass a bus architecture using a network architecture (which allows for the presentation (application) layer to operate independently of the network layer as well as allows for each extensible module (note/workstation/computer) to access the network independently.

HANI M. KAZIMI PRIMARY EXAMINER